



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/660,370	09/12/2000	Thomas P. Hardjono	2204/A55	6652
34845	7590	07/19/2006	EXAMINER	
McGUINNESS & MANARAS LLP 125 NAGOG PARK ACTON, MA 01720			TRAN, TONGOC	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/660,370

Applicant(s)

HARDJONO, THOMAS P.

Examiner

Tongoc Tran

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-12,18-35 and 48-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-12,18-35 and 48-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/30/06.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on May 15, 2006. Claims 2, 4, 13-17, 37-47 and 66-69 have previously been canceled. claims 1, 3, 5-12, 18-35 and 48-65 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on May 30, 2006 has been considered by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/28/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant contends that Ballardie reference fails to shows or suggests the limitation of "the rendezvous point device receives the encoded join request receives the encoded join request and authenticates the encoded join message using the authentication key associated with the host device". Examiner respectfully disagrees. As previously addresses this argument, Ballardie reference teaches the join-request is transmitted from the host to the core or the tree's primary authorization point (the rendezvous point device) and the join-request encompasses the signed token for the host and also contains the key for the host (see Ballardie, page 8-10), Ballardie further mentions that "...many security services, such as authentication, are easier if public key cryptotechniques are employed" (Ballardie, page 2); "For simplicity in our example we assume the presence of an internetwork-wide asymmetric key

management scheme, such as that proposed in [17]...given the presence of asymmetric keys, we can assume digital signatures provide integrity and origin authentication service combined”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1, 3-12, 18-36 and 48-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ballardie (Network Working Group, University College of London, May 1996).

In respect to claim 1, Ballardie discloses a communication system comprising:
a rendezvous point device that forwards multicast communication messages to members of a shared tree; a designated device in communication with the rendezvous point device via a number of intermediate devices (see pages 8-12, e.g. host h, router A and B-intermediate device and Core router-rendezvous point device, page 11);

a host device in communication with a designated device, wherein: the host device forwards an authentication key, generated by a key server for the host device, to the designate device (page 10, last paragraph – page 11, first paragraph, page 2, third paragraph, the key server is inherently required in order for the key to be generated).

the host device sends a join request to the designated device using a predetermined multicast group management protocol in order to join the shared tree for

receiving the multicast communication messages forwarded by the rendezvous point device (pages 9-11);

the designated device receives the join request and forwards to the rendezvous point device via the number of intermediate devices an encoded join request generated using an authentication key associated with the host device (pages 9-10);

the rendezvous point device receives the encoded joint request and authenticates the encoded join message using the authentication key associated with the host device; and the host device is prevented from receiving the multicast communication messages forwards by the rendezvous point device, if the rendezvous point device determined that the encode join message is not authentic (pages 10, last paragraph-page 12, 3rd paragraph); and

In respect to claim 3, Ballardie discloses the communication system of claim 1, wherein the key server provides the authentication key to both the host device and the rendezvous point device using a secure key distribution mechanism (pages 8-11).

In respect to claim 4, Ballardie discloses the communication system of claim 1, wherein the host device sends the authentication key to the designated device (see page 9-10).

In respect to claim 7, Ballardie discloses the communication system of claim 1, wherein the designated device joins the shared tree on behalf of the host device (see pages 10-11).

In respect to claim 8, Ballardie discloses the communication system of claim 7, wherein the designated device establishes appropriate multicast routes for forwarding multicast communication messages to the host (see Ballardie, pages 9-12).

In respect to claim 9, Ballardie discloses the communication system of claim 1, wherein each intermediate device receives the encoded join request and forwards the encoded join request toward other routing element (see page 10).

In respect to claim 10, Ballardie discloses the communication system of claim 9, wherein each intermediate device that is not already joined to the shared tree joins the shared tree on behalf of the host device and establishes appropriate multicast routes for forwarding multicast communication messages toward the host device upon receiving the join request (see Ballardie, pages 8-12).

In respect to claim 11, Ballardie discloses the communication system of claim 9, wherein each intermediate device that is already joined to the shared tree waits for an explicit acknowledgment message from the primary router and establishes appropriate multicast routes for forwarding multicast communication messages toward the host device only upon receiving the explicit acknowledgment message from the primary router (see Ballardie, pages 8-12).

In respect to claim 12, Ballardie disclose the communication system of claim 1, wherein the primary router sends an explicit acknowledgment message toward the host device upon determining that the join request is authentic (see Ballardie, page 9-12).

In respect to claim 18, Ballardie discloses a method comprising:

Obtaining an authentication key associated with a host device from a key server following authentication of the host device by the key server; and sending a join request to a designated device using a predetermined multicast group management protocol, the join request including the authentication key for use by the designated device for encoding the join message prior to forwarding of the join message to rendezvous point (see Ballardie, pages 8-12, page 10, last paragraph – page 11, first paragraph, col. 2, third paragraph, the key server is inherently required in order for the key to be generated).

In respect to claim 19, the claim limitation is similar to claim 6. Therefore, claim 19 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 20-23, the claim limitations are similar to claims 18-19. Therefore, claims 20-23 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 24-25, Ballardie discloses the computer readable medium of claim 22, wherein the computer readable medium is a computer storage medium and a computer communication medium (see Ballardie, page 1).

In respect to claim 26, Ballardie discloses a method comprising:

Receiving a join request from a host device; generating an encoded join request using an authentication key associated with the host device; and sending the encoded join request toward a rendezvous point device to enable authentication of the join message at the rendezvous point using the authentication key associated with the host device (see Ballardie, pages 8-12; page 2, third paragraph).

In respect to claim 27, Ballardie discloses the method of claim 26, wherein the join request includes the authentication key (see Ballardie, page 10).

In respect to claim 28, Ballardie discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising:

Joining a shared tree on behalf of the host device and establishing and establishing appropriate multicast routes for forwarding multicast communication messages to the host devices (see Ballardie, pages 8-12).

In respect to claims 29-36, the claim limitations are similar to claims 24-28. Therefore, claims 29-36 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claim 65, the claim limitation is substantially similar to claim 1. Therefore, claim 65 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claim 48, Ballardie discloses a method comprising:

Receiving, from a designated routing device coupled to a host an encoded join request for the host device, the encoded join request being encoded by the designated routing device using an authentication key associated with the host, the authentication key being received by the host device following authentication of the host device by a key server and forwarded in a join request forwarded from host device to the designed routing device; the authentication key being received by the host device following authentication of the host device by a key server and forwarding in a join request forwarded from host device to the designed routing device (see Ballardie, pages 8-12, note page 10, last paragraph – page 11, first paragraph, page 2, third paragraph, the key server is inherently required in order for the key to be generated and distributed);

Art Unit: 2134

authenticating the encoded join request using the host device authentication key to determine whether or not the encoded joint message is authentic; and establishing appropriate multicast routes for forwarding multicast communication messages to the host device if and only if the join request is determined to be authentic (see Ballardie, pages 8-12, page, e.g. "c also authenticates host h", page 10, last paragraph to page 12, third paragraph; page 2, third paragraph).

In respect to claim 49, Ballardie discloses the method of claim 48, wherein authenticating the encoded join request comprises:

maintaining a number of authentication keys; determining the host device for the encoded join request; and searching for an authentication key associated with the host device (see Ballardie, page 10, last paragraph to page 12, third paragraph).

In respect to claim 50, Ballardie discloses the method of claim 49, wherein authenticating the encoded join request further comprises:

failing to find an authentication key associated with the host device; and
determining that the encoded join request is not authentic (see Ballardie, page 10, last paragraph to page 12, third paragraph).

In respect to claim 51, Ballardie discloses the method of claim 49, wherein authenticating the encoded join request further comprises:

finding an authentication key associated with the host device; and
authenticating the encoded join request using the authentication key associated with the host device (see Ballardie, page 10, last paragraph to page 12, third paragraph).

In respect to claim 52, Ballardie discloses the method of claim 48, further comprising:

sending an explicit acknowledgment toward the host device if and only if the encoded join request is determined to be authentic (see Ballardie, page 10, last paragraph to page 12, third paragraph).

In respect to claims 53-62 and 65, the claim limitations are apparatus and computer readable medium and a communication system claims that are substantially similar to method claims 48-52. Therefore, claims 53-62 and 65 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 63-64, Ballardie discloses the computer readable medium of claim 58, wherein the computer readable medium is a computer storage medium and a communication medium (see Ballardie, page 1).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2134

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571) 272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner: Tongoc Tran
Art Unit: 2134

TT

Jacques Louis Jacques
JACQUES LOUIS JACQUES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100